

(7) affect the right of any court to transfer venue or to apply the law of a foreign nation or to dismiss a claim of a foreign nation or of a citizen of a foreign nation on the ground of inconvenient forum.

(e) **FEDERAL COURT JURISDICTION NOT ESTABLISHED.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to establish any jurisdiction in the district courts of the United States on the basis of section 1331 or 1337 of title 28, United States Code.

(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section:

(1) The term "claimant" means any person who brings a civil action and any person on whose behalf such an action is brought. If such action is brought through or on behalf of an estate, the term includes the decedent. If such action is brought through or on behalf of a minor or incompetent, the term includes the legal guardian of the minor or incompetent.

(2) The term "commerce" means commerce between or among the several States, or with foreign nations.

(3)(A) The term "economic damages" means any objectively verifiable monetary losses resulting from the harm suffered, including past and future medical expenses, loss of past and future earnings, burial costs, costs of repair or replacement, costs of obtaining replacement services in the home (including, without limitation, child care, transportation, food preparation, and household care), costs of making reasonable accommodations to a personal residence, loss of employment, and loss of business or employment opportunities, to the extent recovery for such losses is allowed under applicable State law.

(B) The term "economic damages" shall not include noneconomic damages.

(4) The term "harm" means any legally cognizable wrong or injury for which damages may be imposed.

(5)(A) The term "noneconomic damages" means subjective, nonmonetary loss resulting from harm, including pain, suffering, inconvenience, mental suffering, emotional distress, loss of society and companionship, loss of consortium, injury to reputation, and humiliation.

(B) The term "noneconomic damages" shall not include economic damages or punitive damages.

(6) The term "punitive damages" means damages awarded against any person or entity to punish such persons or entity or to deter such person or entity, or others, from engaging in similar behavior in the future.

(7) The term "State" means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Northern Mariana Islands, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and any other territory or possession of the United States, or any political subdivision of any of the foregoing.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be permitted to meet Wednesday, April 26, 1995, beginning at 9:30 a.m. in room SD-215, to conduct a hearing on child welfare programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the

Senate on Wednesday, April 26, 1995, at 10 a.m. to hold an open confirmation hearing on the nomination of John Deutch to be Director of Central Intelligence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FORESTS AND PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be granted permission to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 26, 1995, for purposes of conducting a subcommittee hearing which is scheduled to begin at 9:45 a.m. The purpose of this oversight hearing is to review the coordination of and conflicts between the Federal forest management and general environmental statutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

A CHANCE FOR JUSTICE IN EAST TIMOR

• Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on January 12 of this year, the Indonesian military tortured and murdered six unarmed civilians in Liquisa, near Dili, in East Timor.

The Indonesian Army Chief of Staff, while reportedly admitting "procedural violations," claimed the victims were supporters of the guerrillas. However, the National Human Rights Commission of Indonesia, which released a scathing report on March 2, accused the military of "unlawful" killings of innocent civilians.

As anyone who follows events in East Timor knows, the Liquisa shootings were not an isolated incident. They were part of a pattern of political violence on the island in which Indonesian troops have been implicated for decades.

However, the fact that the National Human Rights Commission published such a conscientious report is encouraging. The Indonesian Government now has two choices.

One choice is to repeat its mistakes after the November 1991 Dili massacre. Many here will recall how back then, the unarmed demonstrators were sentenced to long prison terms, while a handful of lower ranking soldiers who fired the deadly shots went to jail for a few months and the officers who gave the orders and tried to cover up the crime went scot free.

The other choice is to take responsibility, and use this opportunity to punish severely all those implicated in these crimes, and by doing so deter others from committing such atrocities in the future. Only when the impunity ends will the abuse of human rights end.

Let us hope that the Indonesian Government seizes this opportunity to

demonstrate that no one is above the law, because it is long overdue in a country that seeks to be accepted as a respectable world power. •

TRIBUTE TO RAYMOND J. LANDRY

• Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to one of New Hampshire's finest law enforcement officials, Raymond J. Landry, chief of police of the city of Nashua, on the occasion of his retirement on May 1, 1995.

As a veteran of the U.S. Navy, I am particularly proud of the distinguished professional accomplishments of Chief Landry, who is a Navy man himself.

A Nashua native, Chief Landry has held progressively more responsible positions within the Nashua Police Department since he first joined it in 1964. After serving as a front line police officer for 7 years, Chief Landry was promoted to sergeant in 1971.

Less than 2 years later, in 1973, Chief Landry became a lieutenant. Five years after that, in 1978, Chief Landry was promoted to captain. By 1984, he was named major. Finally, Mr. Landry attained his current high rank as chief of police of the city of Nashua in 1988.

By any measure, Chief Landry has had a most impressive career in the law enforcement field. Throughout his career, he has demonstrated the initiative, dedication, and foresight to gain the best available training to serve the citizens of Nashua. A graduate of the Federal Bureau of Investigation [FBI] National Academy, Chief Landry also is an alumnus of the Command Training Institute and the Advanced Management Practices Program of Babson College. Finally, Mr. President, Chief Landry is a graduate of the Police Executive Development Program of the Pennsylvania State University.

Beyond his first-class training and professional development efforts, Chief Landry has been active in numerous leadership organizations in the law enforcement field. He is a member of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the New England State Police Information Network, the New Hampshire Association of Chiefs of Police, the New England Association of Chiefs of Police, and the Hillsborough County Chiefs Association. In addition, Chief Landry serves on the executive board of the drug task force of the office of the attorney general of New Hampshire.

Mr. President, I understand that there will be a surprise gathering of upwards of 700 people in Nashua on May 5 to honor Chief Raymond Landry as he retires. Law enforcement officials from throughout New Hampshire, as well as State and local dignitaries, will be in attendance.

Mr. President, our Nation's police officers richly deserve the respect in which they are held by our citizens. They serve quietly and effectively, protecting the public and keeping the

peace. All too often, they risk their lives in the line of duty. Having risen to the very top of his profession, Chief Landry can take a great measure of pride in his accomplishments and the admiration in which his colleagues and his constituents in Nashua and throughout New Hampshire hold him.

So, Mr. President, I salute Chief Raymond Landry. I will be with him and his friends in spirit as they celebrate his magnificent career on May 5. May God bless him and grant him a long, happy, and healthy retirement.●

SOCIAL SECURITY—FAMILY SECURITY

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the real contract with America. This contract was not written last summer, and it was not designed to last 100 days. It was written 60 years ago and was designed to last indefinitely. Mr. President, I am referring to Social Security, our primary contract with the American family.

There has been a lot of talk recently about Social Security, much of it negative. There are many misconceptions about what Social Security stands for, what it does, and how it works. Today, I want to set the record straight.

Social Security is a sacred compact between the U.S. Government and the American people. It is a system that gives help to people who practice self-help. Since it was created by President Roosevelt during the New Deal, it has provided financial security, and most importantly, family security for millions of Americans. There are so many problems in our Nation today that are robbing our families of their security. Crime, violence, drugs and divorce are some of the biggest fears that American families face. I do not want to add Social Security to that list of fears.

Social Security is family security. If any of my colleagues doubt that, consider this fact: Twenty-four million Americans rely on Social Security to provide more than half their income. Almost 5½ million Americans rely on Social Security as their only source of income. To all those millions of Americans, Social Security means the ability to put food on the table, to support their families, and to live independently.

Let me address some other misconceptions about Social Security. It is not the cause of our budget deficit. It has never added one penny to our deficit or our national debt. It is an independent, self-financed, and dedicated fund. Social Security is not welfare either. Today's retirees paid into the system and have earned a secure retirement, not a handout.

I will not rob American families of their secure retirement. I will not vote to cut benefits and I will not support legislation that threatens the Social Security trust fund. Throughout my career, I have voted to defend Social Security. I have defended cost of living

adjustments, which protect against the erosion of benefits by inflation. I have opposed a reduction in the Social Security tax, which would jeopardize the trust fund. I supported making Social Security an independent agency, which will ensure that it is run efficiently and smoothly. Finally, I voted to exempt Social Security from the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

If we do not exempt Social Security from a balanced budget amendment, the trust fund will be in jeopardy. Right now there is a surplus in the trust fund. In other words, there is more money being paid into the system by working people than there is being paid out to retirees. By law, this surplus can only be used to pay benefits, the administrative costs of Social Security, and to buy Government securities. These Government securities become part of the trust fund and earn interest, just like Government bonds that we might purchase as an investment. I strongly believe that without it being exempted, this surplus will be raided by politicians in the name of deficit reduction. This would result in emptying the trust fund of the current Government securities, which must be paid back to Social Security. Make no mistake, this means cuts. It means going back on promises we made. It means saying no to people who have spent a lifetime playing by the rules and contributing to the success of this country. It means that the Government cannot hold up its end of the primary contract with American families. And it means robbing families of their security.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle said, "Don't worry. We won't touch Social Security. We want to protect it just like you do." Yet they were not willing to write a protection into the constitutional amendment. I know I will not vote to raid the trust fund, and it may be true that my friends on the other side of the aisle won't either. But I cannot speak for members of a future Congress, and I don't believe they can either. This is the danger that we faced during the balanced budget amendment debate. I am happy to say that it is a danger that we have temporarily avoided.

I am a middle-class Senator. I have spent my career helping those who are not in the middle class get there, and making sure that those who are in the middle class have the security to stay there. Social Security is the linchpin that holds the majority of our retired citizens in the middle class. Promises made must be promises kept. I will continue to fight for the promise of family security that America's retirees have earned.●

TRIBUTE TO CENTRAL FALLS (RI) JR./SR. HIGH SCHOOL

● Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I would like to recognize the achievements of

25 students from Central Falls Jr./Sr. High School of Central Falls, RI.

These students, Kelly Bianchi, Janeth Blandon, Melissa Casto, Berta Couto, Yolanda DaSilva, Daisy Diaz, Elizabeth Diaz, Michelle Doucet, Susan Freitas, Elizabeth Garstka, Martha Gutierrez, Melanie Kowal, Linda Layous, Rebecca Lussier, Michael Macedo, Juan Manzano, Nelci Paiva, Beatriz Patino, Christine Patricio, Celena Sackal, Kathleen Siwy, Hannah Tarawali, Helena Taveira, Agnes Wec, and Alexandra Zaldana have distinguished Central Falls and the State of Rhode Island through their selection as Rhode Island's delegation to the "We the People . . . The Citizens and the Constitution" national finals competition.

I would also like to recognize their teacher, Mr. Bertrand Brousseau, who deserves much of the credit for the success of the team. The district coordinators, John Waycott and Charles Golden, and State coordinator Henry Cote also contributed a great deal of time and effort to help the team reach the national finals.

This program, supported and funded by Congress, has been developed to educate young people about the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The 3-day national competition simulates a congressional hearing in which students' oral presentations are judged on the basis of their knowledge of constitutional principles and their ability to apply them to historical and contemporary issues.

Administered by the Center for Civic Education, "We the People . . . The Citizens and the Constitution," has provided curricular materials at upper elementary, middle, and high school levels for more than 60,000 teachers, 22,000 schools, and 20 million nationwide.

This tremendous program provides an excellent opportunity for students to gain a perspective about the history and principles of our Nation's constitutional Government. I wish these budding constitutional experts the best of luck and look forward to their future participation in our Nation's political arena.●

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I would like to proceed as if in morning business, but I would like a period longer than 5 minutes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, would the Senator allow us to do this and then we will give her what time she might desire, then we will close out. I do not think we will be over 5 or 6 minutes.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Thank you.

Mr. FORD. I thank the Senator.